UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,628	03/28/2006	Ronald Steinbrink	3552	5659
Striker Striker &	7590 08/12/200 & Stenby	EXAMINER		
103 East Neck Road			AURORA, REENA	
Huntington, NY 11743			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2862	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/573,628	STEINBRINK ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Reena Aurora	2862				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTED IN CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISSISTANCE IN COMMENT OF THE MAILING DEPTH OF	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u> .	lune 2008					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٥,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
· ·							
•	Claim(s) <u>1 - 19</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>1 - 19</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				
•	·· — —	· 					

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to amendment received on 6/9/08.

Claims 1 - 19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buselmeier et al. (DE4218793) in view of Lombard et al. (4,594,893).

As to claims 1 – 14, Buselmeier et al. (hereinafter Buselmeier) discloses a sensor comprising a housingless flip chip integrated circuit (1) is mounted on a basic component (6) provided with conductor tracks (2 - 4) and embodied as an MID (Molded Interconnect Device) component, enclosed jointly with the conductor tracks (2 - 4) and optionally further elements by a diamagnetic or paramagnetic covering and directly connected to terminal points (2 - 4) of conductor tracks (2 - 4). Buselmeier fails to disclose that a plastic body of the basic component is composed of at least two different plastic components, at least one of the plastic components is metallized on its surface for forming at least one of the metal conductor tracks. Lombard et al. (Lombard) discloses probe for measuring the level of liquid in a tank or pipe wherein Lombard teaches that metal plates can be replaced by plastic pieces metallized by chemical or

10/573,628 Art Unit: 2862

electrolytic deposit or even by painting a coating with a base of nickel powder by gun. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Buselmeier in view of the teachings of Lombard such that replacing the metal conductor tracks with plastic with metallized surface would decrease the weight and cost of the device.

As to claims 15 - 19, Buselmeier discloses a sensor wherein casting or injection molding of thermoplastic, a basic component (6) is produced; that conductor tracks (2 -4) for the connection to a housingless integrated circuit (1) are mounted on the basic component (6); that the integrated circuit (1) is joined in wireless fashion by the flip-chip technique directly to the conductor tracks (2 - 4), and the arrangement is then sheathed at least partly with an outer encapsulation in a further casting or injection molding process (Note Abstract). Buselmeier fails to disclose that a plastic body of the basic component is composed of at least two different plastic components, at least one of the plastic components is metallized on its surface for forming at least one of the metal conductor tracks. Lombard et al. (Lombard) discloses probe for measuring the level of liquid in a tank or pipe wherein Lombard teaches that metal plates can be replaced by plastic pieces metallized by chemical or electrolytic deposit or even by painting a coating with a base of nickel powder by gun. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Buselmeier in view of the teachings of Lombard such that replacing the metal conductor tracks with plastic with metallized surface would decrease the weight and cost of the device.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reena Aurora whose telephone number is 571-272-2263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

10/573,628

Art Unit: 2862

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Assouad can be reached on 571-272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Reena Aurora

/Reena Aurora/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2862